

RECORD prior to the consideration on the floor.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has filed its report on the bill today. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The text of the reported bill is available on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's web site.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER ON TOMORROW MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2001

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3295 tomorrow.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 3295 be instructed to recede from disagreement with the provisions contained in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 101(a)(3) of the Senate amendment to the House bill (relating to the accessibility of voting systems for individuals with disabilities).

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REFORMING THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the President will go to New York, to Wall Street, to give a much-anticipated speech on reforming the mess in corporate America.

Now this will be an interesting day because this is the same President and Vice President and cabinet who have long touted their extraordinarily tight ties with corporate America; the same President who appointed Harvey Pitt, a former securities lawyer, as head of the Securities Exchange Commission; Mr. Pitt, who, when he was sworn in, promised a kinder, gentler Securities and Exchange Commission, even while all these abuses were going on. And, in fact, recently Mr. Pitt was berated for meeting with people from a firm under

investigation; and he said, well, how could I not meet with people from firms under investigation who I represented? I represented them all.

□ 1915

He is saying as the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, basically if he recused himself for conflict of interest from his former clients, and obviously future clients when he leaves his measly government salary and goes back to earning millions of dollars a year, representing these crooks and swindlers, he would not be able to do his job. In fact, he is not able to do his job.

Just the other day, an administrative law judge dismissed a finding by the SEC because Harvey Pitt could not vote, because he can meet with these people, he can consult with them and talk with them and tell them what the SEC is looking at and doing about them, he can do that; but the line is drawn by Federal law at voting. If he has recently represented these people, which he has, he could not vote.

So in the case of Ernst and Young, Chairman Pitt had to recuse himself. Commissioner Cynthia Glassman had to recuse herself. So there was only one person left to vote who was a Clinton appointee, who did not have a conflict of interest, who had not represented these miscreants previously; and an administrative law judge said that is not adequate, you cannot have just one person vote to prosecute these folks.

Now we are confronted with the fact that we have a Securities and Exchange Commission, which has been dramatically underfunded by the Bush administration, 40 percent less than the House budget which was not adequate. In fact, the President, as recently as March, and his staff were representing a zero funding increase for the Securities and Exchange Commission, the one that is so outgunned, and now the one they are bragging on for doing all of this investigating and putting these people in jail and all this stuff they are going to be doing. Of course, they cannot do any of that if the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission is so extraordinarily conflicted that he cannot vote in any of the prosecutions and other members of the board are also conflicted. In fact, the President has nominated yet another person from another accounting firm to be on the board of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Hopefully, what we will hear tomorrow from the President will be something that is a radical change from the first year and a half of his administration, where they have been coddling these crooks and criminals, the Ken Lays of the world, that basically wrote the energy policy of the United States of America. The Bush administration has yet to release the documents regarding the meetings that Mr. Lay and Enron had with the administration in formulating that policy. We do know

that Enron met more than once a day, more than once a day, this giant corporation met with the energy commission, more than once a day. That is a real good distance. Those are the kind of watchdogs we want.

Mr. Pitt and the SEC are kind of reminding me of my old chessee bear. He is a wonderful old dog, a great watchdog, but he is now 13½ years old, much past his expected longevity for a chessee. His teeth are kind of worn down and he is still a big dog, and even when he barks, we know it is not very serious. That is kind of what we got at the SEC today, and I am afraid that is what we are going to get from the President tomorrow.

There will be some barking, but there are not going to be any real teeth; and we are going to know it is not very serious because the people that they would have to go after are the same people who contributed to the record fundraiser the Republicans had 3 weeks ago, the record amount of money that President Bush raised in his Presidential campaign. Their largess might be constrained. I mean, sure, they have hidden some of it in places where we cannot go after it, like mansions in Florida and that; but we want to make sure, I am certain, that they have some left to contribute to political causes after all.

So I expect we are going to get the toothless, barkless watchdog tomorrow. We are going to have to watch very carefully what the President proposes.

Will he support the Senate bill, the Sarbanes bill? Thus far they have opposed it and supported the phony bill that passed the House to reform some of these practices.

Will they go after the corporate tax havens? Will they go after these thieves and crooks and criminals and put them in jail? Will they try and get Americans back their 401(k)s and pensions or not? The proof will be in the speech tomorrow. We will all listen carefully.

IN HONOR OF BILL RUGER, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak for a few moments about the passing of one of America's talented inventors, industrialists, and sportsmen.

Bill Ruger, Sr., was a long-time friend and constituent of mine. As chairman of Sturm, Ruger and Company, the manufacturer of the world-renowned Ruger gun, Bill gained recognition as an inventor, pioneer, faithful employer, and patriotic American industrialist. The "old man," as many employees and admirers lovingly called him, was the undisputed king of the American sporting industry.

Building on the first sale of the Sturm Ruger standard pistol in 1949,

Bill ultimately created the largest and most widely respected firearms manufacturing concern in the world. For almost 50 years, he built a business, patented numerous innovative ideas and designs, and produced products with legendary appeal and durability. His rare genius was in transforming his innovations into products that won intense customer satisfaction and, in turn, customer loyalty. Bill believed that a well-designed, well-made and reasonably priced product would always attract buyers; and the legions of sportsmen that would never hike a field with anything but a Ruger certainly proved him right.

In some ways, he was the Henry Ford or Thomas Edison of the second half of the 20th century, taking manufacturing processes such as investment casting to new levels, and beating the competition fair and square through timeless quality and efficiency. He had a love for all things mechanical and taught himself most of what he would later use as the basis of his designs. In the process, he became one of the foremost authorities on automotive design and was one of the few people in the world that actually designed and built his own automobile.

Bill Ruger did not build his company in order to sell out and retire, but rather to profit steadily from the success of its products. He believed in taking the long view and built lasting relationships with employees and customers. At a time when manufacturers are heading overseas and across our borders, Sturm Ruger proudly engineers and builds all of its products in the United States.

His success has created great opportunity for many others, including many of my constituents; and his company continues to be a vital part of New Hampshire's economy and community. The "old man," as he was called, leaves a proud legacy to many, not only in New Hampshire but in Arizona and Connecticut as well.

For people who call themselves sportsmen, Bill Ruger was a name that was as celebrated and admired as Ernest Hemingway or Jack O'Connor. Although Bill will be missed by many who take regularly to the field, somehow we will know that he will be along for many more hunts.

Bill viewed a well-crafted gun as a bond that connected families as it was passed from generation to generation. What he may have missed is how one of his creations bonds us to him as his genius and commitment to quality, durability, and affordability live on in perfectly cast steel and finely carved walnut.

That was the gift left to us by the old man. He will be missed by many friends, admirers and employees but especially by his family. I would like to extend my condolences to the Ruger and Vogel families, especially Molly and Bill Ruger, on the passing of their father, a truly great man.

NO VOUCHERS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor because a bill has just been introduced to impose vouchers on the District of Columbia. The Congress had the opportunity to impose vouchers on itself when H.R. 1 was here, the President's Leave No Child Behind bill. Instead, it defeated a voucher proposal 273 to 155; 68 Republicans joined 204 Democrats. It was not even close.

Further, there have been 20 referenda on vouchers, all of them defeated, most recently in California and Michigan. Not only were they defeated overwhelmingly by almost three-quarters of the population in each State but the people of color, minorities, voted even more overwhelmingly against vouchers. In D.C. we had our own voucher vote in the 1980s: 89 percent against, 11 percent for.

What we are asking for in the Nation's capital is the same choices in educating our children that each and every Member of this body has insisted upon already for her own district and in her own State; and do not get me wrong, I do not believe a child can be in the first grade but once. So I strongly believe in choices and alternatives to public schools. The District deserves applause for its efforts on choice because our own efforts far outdo the efforts of any Member of this body. Applause, not punishment, for the choices we have made.

What are our alternatives? First, we have more charter schools in the District of Columbia per capita than any other district. Fourteen percent of our children go to public charter schools. No other Member's district even approaches this percentage of its children in charter schools.

Second, a D.C. child can go out of her own ward to any public school in the District of Columbia. We had children every day going from the poorest wards in 7th and 8th across to more wealthy wards, Ward 3, for example.

Third, I have strongly supported the work of the Washington scholarship fund, a private organization that provides scholarships, mostly to Catholic schools, using private money. I mean that that effort using private money is precisely the way to support our children.

Fourth, D.C. closes schools where it is not up to standard and then reopens them under new leadership. We have done that with nine schools this year with remarkable results.

It is ironic that this bill would come up at this time. Today's Washington Times has an editorial: "D.C. Schools Make Headway." It is an editorial from a newspaper that has been fiercely critical of the D.C. public schools. It opens by saying: "Preliminary test data show that D.C. teachers appear to be teach-

ing and students appear to be learning," and it cites statistics. Fifty percent of the children improved in math and reading. Did they do as well in my colleagues' districts? Children in the most economically deprived neighborhoods improved 20 percent. Did my colleagues' economically deprived children do as well?

All of our charter schools are accountable. We can close charter schools, and have closed three this year, when they are not doing as well with our children. We can close public schools, and we closed nine this year, reopened them and they have done much better under new leadership. We can impose the same requirements on charter public schools as we do on other schools, and those requirements are very stiff. We cannot do that particularly to religious schools because they must not be accountable to the government in the practice of their religion.

I want to be clear about where I stand on the D.C. public schools. I am a proud graduate of the D.C. public schools, but I am not an apologist for them. I am proud of how they are improving. They are not nearly good enough; but by voting against the bill that has been introduced, my colleagues will be voting against choices others have made for their districts, not voting against choice.

We already have multiple choices in the District of Columbia, sufficient choices, so that I invite other Members to look at how to provide choices when their own people have voted against vouchers. There are other ways to acquire and to get choices. We would very much appreciate being allowed to make our own choices the way my colleagues' districts have insisted upon making their own choices.

Read today's Washington Times: "D.C. Schools Make Headway." Add to what my colleagues read. Respect the democratic choices of the citizens of the District of Columbia who are American citizens, entitled to their free choices, in the same way that my colleagues' own constituents are.

DEMOCRATIC PROPOSAL FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention this evening to use the full 60 minutes. I am more likely to use about 20 minutes, but I did want to take the opportunity this evening to talk about an issue which I think was sort of left dangling when we left here a week ago before the July 4th recess.

My colleagues know that in the middle of the night, I guess it was about 2 a.m., we finally voted on the Republican prescription drug plan; and I was extremely disappointed, to say the